

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
03/26/2004	Geoffrey R. Kruse	M61.12-0629	9088
7590 11/13/2006		EXAMINER	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319		CAO, PHUONG THAO	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2164	
	03/26/2004 7590 11/13/2006 CHAMPLIN (MICROS AVENUE SOUTH	03/26/2004 Geoffrey R. Kruse 7590 11/13/2006 CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) AVENUE SOUTH	03/26/2004         Geoffrey R. Kruse         M61.12-0629           7590         11/13/2006         EXAM           CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)         CAO, PHUC           AVENUE SOUTH         ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Interview Summary	10/810,766	KRUSE ET AL.		
milerview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
1) Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner. (3) Alan G. Rego, Agent (Reg. No. 45,956).				
(2) <u>Luke S. Wassum, Primary Examiner</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>07 November 2006</u> .				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.			
Claim(s) discussed: 1.				
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Thompson et al. (US Patent No 6,668,253)</u> .				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/Ā.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached	opy of the amendments that w			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
•				
		·		
	blunt	la. Fac 11/7/06		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Jule & Wasser Primary Examinar AA Drit 2167

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Agent argues that staging tables in the reference are used for transforming and cleasing data coming from multiple systems and the data warehouse database against which the report queries are run has no staging table, while in the claim invention, data accessed by the report query is stored in staging tables. The Agent further argues that a generalized request requires to query directly from a general ledger database and store accessed data in staging tables then report object can get data therefrom. The Examiner maintains that the connection of a financial consolidation application (interpreted as reporting system) to a transformation and staginging server which obtains data from data source application and places data into temporary staging table and provides financial reporting data to the financial consolidation application, still reads on the claimed invention (independent claim 1) in terms of broad interpretation of its claim language. The Examiner indicates that claim 1 does not actually claim how report object can access data from staging table which is claimed in the dependent claim 3. The Examiner suggests that adding limitations of claims 2 and 3 to claim 1 can further specify and distinguish the claimed invention.